

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

JUN 30 2008

## MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSE FRANCISCO DORANTES OLIVER; MARIA DEL ROSARIO HERNANDEZ,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 05-76654

Agency Nos. A95-317-414 A95-317-415

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted June 18, 2008\*\*

Before: REINHARDT, W. FLETCHER, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Jose Francisco Dorantes Oliver and Maria del Rosario Hernandez, married natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings in which an immigration judge ("IJ") denied their applications for cancellation of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen because petitioners failed to set forth any new facts or present any new evidence to demonstrate the requisite hardship. See 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(1) (providing that a motion to reopen "shall state the new facts that will be proven at a hearing to be held if the motion is granted and shall be supported by affidavits or other evidentiary material").

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's underlying order dismissing petitioners' appeal from the IJ's decision because this petition for review is not timely as to that order. *See Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.

RB/Research 2